

111

1 continuously, with Barry Bressler; to some
2 extent with Wil Kipnes and these financial
3 advisors. They were concerned and I was
4 concerned. I guess Jeffrey Pearlman was
5 concerned that if we did that, we would
6 very seriously jeopardize the condition of
7 the company over a short-run period when
8 our main goal was trying to resolve this
9 bankruptcy or else sell the company.

10 (Trustee-7, a letter dated
11 May 9, 2002, marked for identification.)

12 BY MR. LEVY:

13 Q. Trustee-7 is the next exhibit. This
14 is a letter sent by me and my partner to
15 you dated May 9, 2002. Do you remember
16 receiving that letter?

17 A. I think I recall it.

18 Q. When you got this letter in which we
19 asked you -- well, first, let me ask you
20 this: Will you agree that this was not the
21 first time that the Equity Committee or its
22 representatives had requested that you
23 remove Dan Crowley?

24 A. I think you are probably right, but

112

1 I can't be positive of that. If you say
2 it, I accept your statement. But, I don't
3 recall it.

4 Q. In this letter, we suggested the
5 name of three potential crisis managers.
6 Did you consult any of those three we
7 recommended at that time?

8 A. I did not.

9 Q. Did you consult anybody else at that
10 time?

11 A. I had these discussions that I have
12 talked to you about today.

13 Q. When you talked to Jeff Pearlman and
14 he said be careful that is, essentially,
15 about whether or not replacing Crowley, did
16 he indicate that there was anything special
17 about Coram that required special care in
18 not replacing the CEO?

19 A. I don't think he discussed anything
20 special about Coram. He was thinking about
21 the health care industry.

22 Q. You are familiar with the fact,
23 aren't you, that in recent, in the recent
24 year or two, some very large companies that

113

1 have gone into bankruptcy have immediately
2 fired their CEOs?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. For example, you probably read this
5 morning's Wall Street Journal that the
6 world's third largest retailer fired its
7 CEO and CFO because there was some
8 potential accounting irregularity?

9 A. That is not a bankruptcy context.

10 Q. That's true. Did you read that?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. You know that WorldCom fired its
13 chief executive officer when they filed
14 what is the world's largest Chapter 11?
15 You are aware of that?

16 A. I have read about it.

17 Q. Did you consider the possibility
18 that, perhaps, Mr. Pearlman and your other
19 advisors were wrong in that Coram would
20 survive very well with the crisis manager,
21 notwithstanding a replacement of Dan Crowley?

22 A. Of course.

23 Q. Did you ever consult a crisis
24 manager, someone experienced in this field,

114

1 and say something on the order of I'm
2 concerned if I put you in there, it will
3 destroy the company? What has your
4 experience been?

5 A. I never did.

6 Q. Why?

7 A. I was not looking at this situation
8 as a long-term situation such as WorldCom
9 or AHold (phonetic). As I have said
10 repeatedly this morning, I thought my job
11 was to try to get this company out of
12 bankruptcy as promptly as possible and I
13 didn't want to shake the foundations before
14 that could be done. Now, maybe I was
15 wrong. I don't think I was. If anybody
16 can prove that to me, I will cheerfully
17 step down. I don't need this job. I
18 didn't seek the job. All I can use is my
19 best judgment. I tried to do it.
20 Apparently, I have satisfied most of the
21 people, except you and Don and I'm sorry
22 about that. I would have loved to have
23 satisfied you. Through my professional
24 life, I have been able to satisfy most

115

1 people. Certainly with my integrity, which
2 you seem to be attacking this morning,
3 which concerns me very greatly, but that is
4 your job and if I can't do this job, I will
5 cheerfully step down and I will tell that
6 to the Trustee as I am doing right now
7 because his representative is here. But,
8 it's your judgment against my judgment and
9 although I respect your judgment, I have to
10 adhere to my best judgment.

11 Q. Of course you do. I am not and
12 never have attacked your integrity. I
13 understand that there could be a difference
14 of opinion as to whether there should be a
15 crisis manager.

16 My point, sir, is, and just
17 confirm this for me, you never consulted
18 anyone other than Mr. Pearlman and your
19 lawyers here about whether their views as
20 to whether a crisis manager would have
21 upset the apple cart here?

22 MR. NEUWIRTH: Objection.

23 THE WITNESS: That is true.

24 The reason is because I had gone on the

116

1 premises and had interviewed all the
2 executives individually and became
3 convinced, perhaps incorrectly, that the
4 best way to preserve value here was
5 continuing until we could have a plan.
6 Now, maybe I'm incorrect, but that is my
7 best judgment.

8 Q. Roughly, how many executives did you
9 interview and for what purpose?

10 A. We used to have a list. I would say
11 twelve, thirteen.

12 Q. Did any one of those executives tell
13 you or suggest to you that if Crowley was
14 replaced by a crisis manager, they would
15 quit?

16 A. No. But what they suggested is if
17 we disturb the operation, it would hurt the
18 morale and some of them would quit.

19 Q. Who said they would quit?

20 A. I didn't say that. They said that
21 some of the colleagues would quit.

22 Q. Not the twelve you interviewed, but
23 someone else?

24 A. No. Among those, but they didn't

117

1 put their finger on it.

2 MR. BEATIE: You

3 consistently misstate his testimony. Is
4 it a professional preference?

5 THE WITNESS: One would say
6 if you disturb this situation, you run
7 the risk that some of our colleagues may
8 seek a different assignment.

9 BY MR. LEVY:

10 Q. One of them said that to you and did
11 you say, well, Joe over here says some
12 people may quit. Are you one of the people
13 who would quit?

14 A. No. I never did ask.

15 Q. Why?

16 A. Because I didn't do it. That's not
17 my style. That may be your style. It's
18 just not my style.

19 Q. What advice did you get from your
20 lawyers here about whether replacing
21 Crowley would cause a problem in the
22 company?

23 A. Would cause?

24 Q. A problem at Coram.

118

1 A. They said we have to be very careful
2 of doing that.

3 Q. Did they explain to you why they
4 thought so?

5 A. They talked to the executives, too.
6 They talked to these various executives
7 from time to time and they are aware that
8 it is a very ticklish situation?

9 Q. Did they -- who are we talking
10 about? Mr. Bressler? Kipnes? Devine?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Did any executive ever say that if
13 you replace Crowley with a crisis manager,
14 I'm going to look for another job?

15 A. No, I don't think any of them said
16 that.

17 Q. Nobody ever said that to you?

18 MR. MILLER: Objection. He
19 testified a few minutes ago that people
20 in Denver told him that.

21 THE WITNESS: Nobody said if
22 you bring in a crisis manager, I will
23 resign. Nobody said that.

24 Q. Nobody ever specified who, what

119

1 other persons might resign if you bring in
2 a crisis manager?

3 A. Nobody named any such person..

4 MR. BEATIE: Number five.

5 BY MR. LEVY:

6 Q. Do you remember meeting with Sam
7 Zell?

8 A. I do.

9 Q. Did you have a discussion with him
10 about replacing Crowley with an independent
11 crisis manager?

12 A. I don't know whether that got into
13 our discussion. It may have. I don't have
14 any precise recollection of that. I know
15 that we had a very nice discussion. I have
16 great respect for him. We developed a
17 very, I thought, good relationship in that
18 very limited period of time. I thought
19 Mr. Zell was primarily interested in what
20 amount the shareholders could get in a
21 resolution of the problem. I respected
22 that. He was an investor; and although he
23 had already achieved a great profit by that
24 time, I think he allowed as much -- I was

120

1 trying to get for him and his colleagues
2 who were fellow shareholders the maximum
3 amount. That is a primary goal of mine.
4 So, we really were not very far apart on
5 that. I thought that the figure that he
6 had in mind was an unrealistic figure, but
7 he is a good salesman and I recognize that
8 and I was perfectly prepared to do the best
9 I could for him and his colleagues. We
10 left on the most of cordial terms. He
11 wrote me a letter afterwards, which I
12 thought was a very nice letter which kind
13 of restated what he had told me. And if
14 you have it in front of you, it will
15 refresh my mind. I don't remember everything
16 he said.

17 Q. That's the letter which we will mark
18 as number 8. It is Trustee number 6432.

19 (Trustee-8, a letter dated
20 September 17, 2002, marked for
21 identification.)

22 THE WITNESS: I forgot when
23 he visited me, we had been talking about
24 a draft of a complaint that you and your

121

1 colleagues had developed which we were
2 giving a great deal of attention to and
3 I mentions that in the letter.

4 Q. It was the Complaint that we
5 presented to you on May 7.

6 A. Correct. I don't know the date.
7 Thereabouts.

8 Q. You said to us at that meeting that
9 is a very good Complaint and would probably
10 pass a motion to dismiss.

11 MR. KIPNES: Objection to
12 the question. Beyond, well beyond the
13 scope. This letter from Mr. Zell, I
14 believe, is eight days before a
15 mediation.

16 MR. LEVY: I'm talking about
17 May.

18 MR. KIPNES: You are not
19 talking about Mr. Crowley.

20 MR. LEVY: I think I am.

21 THE WITNESS: You are saying
22 at the meeting I had made a comment that
23 it was a pretty good complaint and it
24 may very well be able to survive Summary

122

1 Judgment?

2 Q. Yes.

3 A. I don't deny that. I don't recall
4 that I said it. It sounds like --

5 MR. GODNICK: The question
6 was with regard to a motion to dismiss,
7 notwithstanding the objectionable nature
8 of the question, not with respect to
9 Summary Judgment.

10 THE WITNESS: Okay. I don't
11 recall that.

12 MR. KIPNES: In no event
13 does any of this have anything to do
14 with what we are here for today.

15 MR. MILLER: That is true of
16 most of the questions today.

17 BY MR. LEVY:

18 Q. This letter you got from Sam Zell,
19 does it pretty much accurately reflect what
20 went on at the meeting?

21 A. He is not a lawyer. He is a very
22 good businessman. I don't know that it's
23 word-for-word. In substance, it reflects
24 what we talked about. Is he a lawyer?

123

1 Yes, I guess he did tell me he had gone to
2 law school. I beg your pardon.

3 Q. He is proud of that. He practiced
4 for six months.

5 MR. GODNICK: Could we have
6 a question, please?

7 BY MR. LEVY:

8 Q. Does it now refresh your recollection
9 that Mr. Zell did ask that Mr. Crowley be
10 removed as CEO?

11 A. That does refresh my recollection.

12 Q. You, at that point, raised the
13 question of available management should you
14 terminate Crowley?

15 A. He said he thought that you either
16 had given me names or were about to give me
17 names. And, I think, the fact is you had
18 submitted names. That's my recollection.
19 I may be wrong on the timing of it.

20 Q. Did you at that meeting, when he
21 suggested you terminate Crowley, say in
22 substance that if you did, it would make
23 Goldman Sachs very angry?

24 A. No, never said anything like that.

124

1 Q. Nothing like that?

2 A. No. I told him at the time that
3 there was a feeling that he had some, that
4 there was some tension between Goldman
5 Sachs and himself. And he went on and
6 explained the past relationship that he had
7 with Goldman Sachs dealing with the
8 property at Radio City and that a person
9 who is known to both of us was involved

10

11

12

13 Q. That would be?

14 A. If I heard his name, I could tell
15 you.

16 MR. KIPNES: Does it start
17 with an L?

18 THE WITNESS: Lindeman.

19 Peter is the first name.

20 BY MR. LEVY:

21 Q. Did you ever consider, ever consider
22 getting rid of Crowley and filling the
23 position from within the company?

24 A. We did, yes. We did. That was one

1 of the options that we considered.

2 Q. When did you consider that?

3 A. I can't tell you the date. I
4 remember talking with Barry Bressler about
5 the qualifications of Marabito who was
6 right below Crowley and we were concerned
7 that he did not have the same skills that
8 Crowley had in trying to keep the
9 organization together.

10 Q. That was Mr. Bressler's view?

11 A. I don't know whether it was Mr.
12 Bressler's view or Joe Devinc's view. It
13 was a concern.

14 Q. When you asked for their views, you
15 were not seeking legal advice?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Did anybody ever, did somebody
18 suggest to you that you should consider
19 filling it from within?

20 A. No, I think that idea came from me.

21 Q. From you. Let's see if I can
22 refresh your recollection on that.

23 (Trustee-9, a memorandum
24 from Mr. Weber and Mr. Bemiss to Barry

126

1 Bressler, marked for identification.)

2 BY MR. LEVY:

3 Q. The next document, Exhibit 9, is a
4 memorandum from SSG Capital Advisors. I'm
5 sorry, actually from Michael Weber and Sam
6 Bemiss at EMB & Company addressed to Barry
7 Bressler. It Bates numbered 6323 through
8 25. It is addressed to Bressler. I take
9 it, you have seen it?

10 A. I think he came in and discussed it
11 with me.

12 Q. Why on October 28 were your
13 financial advisors giving you suggestions
14 for an executive who could potentially step
15 into an interim and possible permanent role
16 at Coram Health Care?

17 MR. GODNICK: Objection.

18 A. We had taken Sam Zell's suggestions
19 seriously. We had taken -- Don, your
20 colleague, had been persistent in that
21 point of view. We took it very seriously.
22 We discussed it with those two gentlemen
23 whose name appear on this exhibit plus the
24 other people I have talked about. They

127

1 responded with this document. It is
2 addressed to Barry Bressler because they
3 had a better relationship with him than
4 with me from prior to this situation. He
5 came in and discussed it. That's how it
6 evolved. We always took what you said
7 seriously.

8 Q. And did you discuss with your
9 financial advisors at that time after you
10 got this memo whether taking one of their
11 suggestions here would cause problems at
12 Coram?

13 A. I think at this time this was a
14 different consideration. My recollection
15 is that at this particular time, we were
16 trying to develop a plan and, I think, we
17 were hopeful of filing such a plan in
18 January. If I'm not mistaken and this
19 is -- what is the date of this? This is
20 October 28, practically November 1st. So,
21 we are talking about November and December.
22 To make a change for two months, we were
23 going to have a plan in January, and it
24 just didn't seem to be practical or

128

1 sensible, so we put it aside.

2 It developed that because of
3 certain things that you have done, that has
4 been delayed. We now think we can fill a
5 plan in March, but we can't just at this
6 time thinking of, whereas meeting the
7 suggestions that you and the equity people
8 have, you are only a piece of the action,
9 you are an important piece, but there is a
10 company to run. There are creditors,
11 Noteholders. And it's my job to consider
12 the entire mosaic. You disagree with the
13 way I have done it. You are entitled to
14 that opinion. You are entitled to more
15 than that. You are entitled to move to
16 have me removed and I think, frankly, you
17 ought to do that.

18 Q. What did I, myself, do to delay your
19 filing of a plan?

20 A. Well --

21 MR. KIPNES: We are really
22 far afield from Mr. Crowley. If it's
23 following up on what Judge Adams said,
24 well, it's got nothing to do with

129

1 Mr. Crowley.

2 MR. LEVY: Please.

3 THE WITNESS: I think you

4 filed a plan.

5 BY MR. LEVY:

6 Q. Did that delay you?

7 A. Well, I think you and Don and your
8 colleagues have used up a lot of the time
9 of our people. I think far more than
10 anyone else. We can't do everything. I
11 have tried desperately to keep our expenses
12 to a minimum. And I still interpret your
13 questions, perhaps incorrectly, as an
14 attack on me and what I have done and what
15 I do on a day-to-day basis. I cannot
16 satisfy the points that you are making.
17 It's beyond me. I can't do it. If the
18 judge agrees with you and the Trustee
19 agrees with you, I have said several times,
20 I will cheerfully withdraw.

21 Q. Do you know why as your financial
22 advisors prepared these suggestions that
23 are in Exhibit 9, do you know why did they
24 write this

130

1 MR. GODNICK: Asked and
2 answered.

3 THE WITNESS: I'm sure that
4 we discussed the matter with him.

5 BY MR. LEVY:

6 Q. In October, the end of October, when
7 you thought you were going to file a plan
8 two months later, tell me if I'm
9 understanding you correctly, you asked them
10 to give you suggestions for someone who
11 could step into an interim role?

12 A. I think this came from before
13 October. We were talking to them. I think
14 when we first interviewed these people, I
15 guess, in June, I don't remember the date,
16 several months before this, that was one of
17 the questions that I put to them. Why did
18 they write that on this date? I can't tell
19 you.

20 Q. Did you ever discuss with your
21 investment advisors their views as to
22 whether replacing Crowley would cause
23 problems at Coram?

24 A. Yes, we did. We did. They went

131

1 further. They said if you are thinking in
2 terms of selling the company -- that was
3 one of the discussions. That was an
4 extensive discussion. That will hurt any
5 attempt at same.

6 Q. Who said that?

7 A. I think Victor. What is Victor's
8 name?

9 Q. Scott Victor?

10 A. Scott Victor.

11 Q. He said it to you?

12 A. He said it at the meeting. He
13 didn't say it just to me.

14 Q. What meeting?

15 A. We had a meeting with them.

16 Q. When? Who was there?

17 A. I can't tell you when.

18 Q. About when?

19 A. I would say September, but I'm just
20 guessing. I don't know the date of the
21 meeting.

22 Q. Can you tell me who was there?

23 A. I'm sure Barry Bressler was there.

24 I don't know whether Wil Kipnes was there.

132

1 MR. KIPNES: I was not.

2 THE WITNESS: I think

3 Mr. Devine was there. One of your other
4 associates was there, Farkasie. I can't
5 remember everybody's name.

6 MR. KIPNES: The potential
7 sale of the company has what to do with
8 Mr. Crowley?

9 BY MR. LEVY:

10 Q. In Exhibit 9 --

11 MR. MILLER: Is that what
12 this deposition is about?

13 Q. Your investment advisors talked
14 about the reasonable depth of some
15 management talent at Coram. Do you agree
16 that Coram has reasonable depth of
17 management talent?

18 A. I think it's pretty good, yes. I
19 thought it was pretty good.

20 Q. Did you, as they suggested after
21 looking inside, did you look outside the
22 home health care industry for CEO talent?

23 A. Did I look?

24 Q. Did you or did you cause anyone on

133

1 your behalf to?

2 A. No. But I was completely open to
3 that. I didn't think that that was out of
4 the line, out of line.

5 Q. What did you do about it? Did you
6 tell -- did you say to one of your people
7 let's go look outside?

8 A. No, because I was concentrating, I
9 have said this time and time again, at that
10 time I was concentrating on filing a plan
11 in January. Now, could I have concentrated
12 on filing a plan and looking more? Yes, I
13 guess so. If I had an unlimited amount of
14 time and wanted to spend money, I could
15 have done that.

16 Q. How about spending the equity
17 from --

18 A. Exactly. You are exactly right.

19 (Luncheon recess taken,

20 12:30 p.m.)

21 (Afternoon session, 1:08

22 p.m.)

23 BY MR. LEVY:

24 Q. Mr. Adams, I wonder if you would

134

1 repeat on the record what you just said
2 about Exhibit 9.

3 A. Yes, sir. Near the end of the
4 morning session, Mr. Levy, you were asking
5 me some questions about Trustee's Exhibit 9
6 dated October 28, 2002. I think you were
7 wondering how that developed timewise. In
8 thinking about it at lunch, I recall that
9 we were, once again, considering a
10 substitution for Mr. Crowley because we
11 knew that his contract was going to expire,
12 I think, November 30. I may be wrong on
13 that.

14 Q. The 29th.

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Thank you.

17 I will change subjects now.
18 Let me just review very briefly. Did I
19 understand correctly that after your
20 meeting with Crowley that on March 25, 26,
21 that at that point in time, you had come to
22 the conclusion that Crowley did not have a
23 conflict?

24 A. Pretty much I had come to that

135

1 conclusion based on his questions. There
2 was one other thing that took place at that
3 meeting that I thought about and that is my
4 discussion with him about Cerberus, I hope
5 I'm not mispronouncing it. He did say that
6 from time to time they would ask him to
7 evaluate situations, and I said, "Do they
8 compensate you for that?" He said, "No."
9 I said, "Well, if it has nothing to do with
10 Coram, they are not competitors of Coram,
11 they in no way impact on Coram, and you do
12 that off company time, I don't think I
13 would object to that." He said, "Well, of
14 course." Some discussion like that.

15 Q. Let me be clear. One of the
16 conditions was that he not be compensated
17 for --

18 A. That's what I said.

19 Q. That what you said to him?

20 A. That's right.

21 Q. Did he agree that he would not be
22 compensated or seek compensation if he did
23 that kind of work?

24 A. Yes. He said, "Oh, I understand. I

136

1 understand." Something like that.

2 Q. I think you said you had pretty much
3 come, subject to what you just said, you
4 said that at that meeting or at the
5 conclusion of that meeting you had pretty
6 much come to a conclusion that at that
7 point in time he had no conflict?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. "Pretty much" is less than
10 completely. Could you help me and tell me
11 what reservations you had at that point?

12 A. Well, some of the reservations that
13 you pointed out. After all, I didn't know
14 this gentleman. This was the first time I
15 had met him face-to-face. He wasn't giving
16 me anything in writing, not that I asked
17 him for anything in writing. He was
18 speaking orally, of course, and I was going
19 to go back and talk to Barry Bressler, my
20 counsel, which I did.

21 Q. What did you say to Barry?

22 A. Exactly what had happened; just what
23 I have told you this morning.

24 Q. What did Barry say?

137

1 A. He has to speak for himself.

2 MR. GODNICK: A business
3 conversation or --

4 MR. LEVY: That is an
5 improper objection.

6 BY MR. LEVY:

7 Q. Go on.

8 MR. KIPNES: It's not an
9 improper objection. But unless you want
10 to give me the stipulation I asked you
11 to give me so that we could speed things
12 along --

13 MR. BEATIE: Not only is it
14 not improper, it's in the rules for a
15 change that --

16 MR. LEVY: The fact that
17 these questions are being answered at
18 this deposition does not itself
19 constitute a waiver.

20 MR. KIPNES: You will not so
21 assert? That's what I asked you for.
22 That's fine. Go ahead.

23 THE WITNESS: I really can't
24 tell you accurately how that

138

1 conversation ended, except to say that
2 we were prepared to let the situation
3 alone, at least for that time being, let
4 it alone for that period of time. That
5 is not a very accurate description
6 sitting here. That is about the best I
7 can say.

8 Q. Did you rely on what Barry told you,
9 at least in part, in making the decision?

10 A. In part. But I was relying on my
11 own judgment as well. I have the utmost
12 confidence in Mr. Bressler, but I want to
13 make it clear that these judgments I'm
14 responsible for.

15 Q. Now, when you made -- this is a
16 December 27 letter signed by both Dan
17 Crowley and Steve Feinberg. We will mark
18 that as number 10.

19 (Trustee Exhibit 10, a
20 letter dated December 27, 2001, marked
21 for identification.)

22 BY MR. LEVY:

23 Q. There are two copies and they have
24 different production numbers.

139

1 MS. KRUGMAN: Can you just
2 identify those Bates numbers for me,
3 please?

4 MR. LEVY: CRX 607 and 752.

5 MS. KRUGMAN: Thank you.

6 BY MR. LEVY:

7 Q. My question, Mr. Adams is: At the
8 time you had, I think you said pretty much
9 come to the conclusion that there was no
10 ongoing conflict, were you aware that on
11 December 27, Feinberg and Crowley had
12 agreed to suspend their contract for one
13 month, that is, January of 2002, and that
14 they had agreed that the suspension will
15 end on January 31st, 2002? Were you aware
16 of that?

17 A. I was not aware of this exhibit,
18 10. Nobody told me about the contents of
19 this exhibit.

20 Q. You had never known about it until I
21 handed it to you just a moment ago?

22 A. I didn't see this letter until
23 today, to my knowledge.

24 Q. Do you draw a distinction in your

140

1 mind between suspending a contract and
2 terminating a contract?

3 A. I guess if there is a distinction,
4 if you terminate it, it's ended, period.
5 If you suspend it, it's held in kind of
6 abeyance. I have not looked up the
7 definition, but something like that.

8 Q. Held in abeyance meaning?

9 A. For the future.

10 Q. So, would it be your understanding
11 looking at this letter now what these
12 parties intended is that they were holding
13 their contract for the future, that is,
14 after January 31st?

15 A. I don't know what they had intended.
16 I never saw it. I really don't have a
17 conclusion on that document.

18 Q. Do you think if you would had seen
19 this when you reached your conclusion on
20 March 25 or 26 that, or your conclusion
21 that you felt pretty much, that you felt
22 there was no conflict, do you think it
23 might have affected that decision?

24 MR. GODNICK: Objection.

141

1 THE WITNESS: I think it
2 would have affected the decision to the
3 extent that I would have asked for a
4 clarification.

5 Q. What clarification do you think you
6 would have?

7 A. I would have asked what does this
8 document mean.

9 Q. Because of the use of the word
10 suspension?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. The next document is a January 29th
13 letter, also signed by Dan Crowley and
14 Steve Feinberg. This one has the Bates
15 number CRX 00754. Mr. Adams, you should
16 understand that means it was produced by
17 Dan Crowley's lawyers.

18 (Trustee-11, a letter dated
19 January 29, 2002, marked for
20 identification.)

21 THE WITNESS: That's the
22 same as 10, that exhibit. It changes
23 the month.

24 Q. Correct. Can I assume you were not

142

1 aware of number 11 when you came to your
2 conclusion on March 25 or 26, just as you
3 were not --

4 A. I don't think I saw Trustee-11 until
5 today.

6 Q. And I assume -- can I assume that if
7 you had seen it when you met with Crowley
8 at the end of March, you would have asked
9 for a clarification?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. You would have asked him what
12 suspension meant?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. The next is a letter dated February
15 18. This one is from Mr. Schreiber, this
16 is number twelve. This is from Mr. Schreiber
17 who, of course, is Mr. Crowley's lawyer to
18 Mr. Michael Cook who is the lawyer for
19 Cerberus. It shows a copy to Dan Crowley
20 and others.

21 (Trustee-12, a letter dated
22 February 18, 2002, marked for
23 identification.)

24 BY MR. LEVY:

143

1 Q. One was produced by, according to
2 the Bates numbers, by Crowley; the other by
3 Cerberus, by Mr. Cook.

4 Have you looked through it?
5 Have you ever seen this letter before
6 today?

7 A. I don't believe so. I have not
8 finished reading it.

9 Q. Take your time.

10 A. Already it strikes me as something
11 that I have not seen. I have had a chance
12 to read it. I never saw it before.

13 Q. Note that in the first paragraph,
14 Mr. Schreiber writes, "For 2001,
15 Mr. Crowley believes he is entitled to" --

16 MR. KIPNES: This would be
17 the second paragraph.

18 BY MR. LEVY:

19 Q. Yes. "For 2001, Mr. Crowley
20 believes he is entitled to an additional
21 \$1,950,000 related to Coram's EBITDA
22 performance." Do you see that?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. If you had had that available when

144

1 you met with Mr. Crowley and came to your
2 conclusion that there was no conflict,
3 might you have asked him why he was writing
4 to Michael Cook who was Cerberus's lawyer?

5 MR. GODNICK: Objection.

6 This is not a letter from Crowley to
7 Cook. It's a letter from Crowley's
8 attorneys and there has been no
9 foundation that, in fact, Mr. Crowley
10 directed his lawyers to write to
11 Mr. Cook with regard to the subject
12 matter of this letter.

13 MR. LEVY: Fair objection.

14 BY MR. LEVY:

15 Q. Would you assume this was written by
16 Mr. Crowley's lawyer, assuming
17 Mr. Crowley's lawyer was instructed to
18 write it on his behalf? Would you have
19 made that inquiry?

20 A. I certainly would have talked to him
21 about it.

22 Q. You would have made the inquiry?

23 A. Yes, I would have talked to him
24 about it.

145

1 Q. What would you have asked?

2 A. How can I tell? It's a hypothetical
3 question. I didn't have the letter. I
4 didn't talk to him. You are asking me what
5 I would have done had I had the letter and
6 talk to him. I don't know.

7 Q. I guess I should rephrase it. What
8 kind of investigation might you have
9 triggered in your mind in view of the fact
10 that, again, assuming Crowley authorized
11 this letter?

12 MR. KIPNES: I would object
13 on the basis --

14 MR. LEVY: I'm not finished
15 with --

16 BY MR. LEVY:

17 Q. That he appears, perhaps, to be
18 asking Cerberus to pay him this money.

19 MR. KIPNES: Objection.
20 Incomplete hypothetical.

21 MR. GODNICK: Objection.

22 MR. KIPNES: Among many
23 other objectionable reasons.

24 THE WITNESS: I can't answer

146

1 the question. I don't know what I would
2 have done, but I suspect I would have
3 had some discussion on this subject.

4 BY MR. LEVY:

5 Q. And in the next paragraph, this
6 letter says, "To facilitate the possibility
7 of settling the various disputes related to
8 Coram's bankruptcy, Mr. Crowley has also
9 been waiving his \$80,000 monthly retainer
10 from Cerberus for the past two months."

11 If you had had this letter
12 and you came to your conclusion on March 25
13 and 6, you were pretty sure there was no
14 conflict, would you have asked any
15 questions about that?

16 A. I suspect, yes.

17 Q. You might have said are you going to
18 waive it past two months, right?

19 A. I don't know what I would have said.
20 It's pretty hard to put myself in that
21 position. I suspect I would have
22 questioned what this is all about.

23 Q. Do you intend to ask Mr. Crowley
24 between now and the end of this case what

147

1 was meant by this, what was meant by
2 suspension?

3 MR. KIPNES: Objection.

4 THE WITNESS: Do I intend
5 now to ask him?

6 Q. Yes. Or your attorney's ask him.

7 A. I certainly will discuss it with
8 Mr. Bressler and decide a point of action.

9 Q. Is it your view at this point
10 without having discussed it with him, that
11 it's something you ought to look into or he
12 ought to look into?

13 A. Yes. But I don't think it's a good
14 idea for somebody in my position to do this
15 kind of thing without discussion with
16 counsel.

17 Q. No problem.

18 MR. GODNICK: Will you,
19 Judge Adams?

20 MR. LEVY: That is an
21 improper interruption. I will show it
22 to him. From you, I wouldn't have
23 expected that.

24 BY MR. LEVY:

148

1 Q. At the bottom of the page,
2 Mr. Schreiber says, "Given the financial
3 consequences, Mr. Crowley is experiencing
4 as a result of the ongoing dispute between
5 the Noteholders and the Equity Committee,
6 we will be recommending that Mr. Crowley
7 tender his resignation unless the dispute
8 between the Noteholders and the equity
9 holders is resolved on or before March 1st,
10 2002 and assurances are provided to
11 Mr. Crowley that the contractual incentives
12 entitlements earned by him will be promptly
13 honored."

14 Would that have raised
15 questions in your mind had you known about
16 this letter when you came to the conclusion
17 on March 25 or 26 that there probably was
18 no conflict?

19 A. I think it would.

20 Q. Mr. Cook responded on February 25,
21 to Mr. Schreiber on a document marked
22 Cerberus 20084.

23 (Trustee-13, a letter dated
24 February 25, 2002, marked for

149

1 identification.)

2 BY MR. LEVY:

3 Q. You were not aware of that?

4 A. I was not.

5 Q. The next document is dated

6 February 28, 2002, number CRX 00763, a

7 letter that appears to be between Dan

8 Crowley and Steven Feinberg, but it's only

9 signed by Dan Crowley.

10 (Trustee-14, a letter dated

11 February 28, 2002, marked for

12 identification.)

13 MR. KIPNES: Attached to the

14 exhibit that you handed me, the copy, as

15 Trustee Exhibit 14, the last page of

16 which is a letter dated August 20, 2002,

17 bears Bates numbers CRX 008716. I was

18 going to ask you whether -- should we

19 just remove that?

20 MR. LEVY: The entire

21 Exhibit 14 is 763 through 767 inclusive.

22 MR. KIPNES: Okay.

23 MR. LEVY: I'm talking about

24 this exhibit.

150

1 MR. KIPNES: The one you
2 just handed me.

3 MR. LEVY: Let's see if we
4 can get through this.

5 MR. MILLER: Was there a
6 question about Exhibit 13?

7 MR. LEVY: The only question
8 was had he seen it. He said no.

9 MR. MILLER: Thank you.

10 BY MR. LEVY:

11 Q. I assume Exhibit 14, the
12 February 28th letter, you have never seen
13 that before today?

14 A. I did not.

15 Q. If you had seen that at the time you
16 concluded on March 25 and 26 that there was
17 no conflict, would that have raised
18 questions in your mind?

19 A. I would have questioned it.

20 Q. You would have questioned -- would
21 you have questioned -- the last sentence
22 is, "The suspension of obligations will end
23 on March 31st." You would have
24 questioned --

151

1 A. That seems to me to be the same
2 phraseology as a number of previous
3 exhibits you have shown me covering
4 January, February and March and I would
5 have asked about them collectively.

6 Q. Right. You probably would have
7 asked why Feinberg didn't sign it, is that
8 a fair assumption?

9 A. I didn't hear the question.

10 Q. You probably would have asked why
11 Feinberg did not sign it?

12 A. Probably.

13 MR. BEATIE: You have not
14 figured out how to ask that question
15 yet.

16 BY MR. LEVY:

17 Q. The next document is a letter
18 addressed to you dated March 11, 2002. It
19 has Bates numbers CRX 60, 61 and 62 and it
20 is signed, or there is a signature block
21 for Dan Crowley.

22 MR. MILLER: What is the
23 document?

24 MR. LEVY: It's a letter,

152

1 addressed to --

2 MR. KIPNES: It's addressed
3 to Judge Adams. The date of the letter
4 is March 26, 2000.

5 MR. LEVY: March 11.

6 MR. KIPNES: I'm looking at
7 what I was just handed. It says
8 March 26. That's the wrong one.

9 MR. LEVY: 60 and 61 and 62.

10 (Trustee-15, a letter dated
11 March 11, 2002, with attachments, marked
12 for identification.)

13 MR. LEVY: Let me, before
14 anybody points it out, there is a word
15 written on the top which was not on the
16 original. It was a dread faxing error.
17 It should not be part of what is on
18 there. I ask you to simply strike
19 through whatever that says. It's not
20 part of the exhibit. That is my
21 handwriting there.

22 BY MR. LEVY:

23 Q. Do you remember receiving that
24 letter?

153

1 A. That is my recollection, yes.

2 Q. Let me ask you whether, referring,
3 essentially, to the first three pages --

4 A. That's all I have looked at.

5 Q. That's fine. Would you -- I
6 characterize this letter as a "puffing"
7 letter. Would you agree with that?

8 MR. GODNICK: Objection to
9 the form of the question.

10 THE WITNESS: I never
11 characterized it.

12 Q. Did it occur to you when you read
13 this -- did you ever discuss this letter
14 with Crowley?

15 A. I can't say sitting here that I did
16 discuss it with Crowley. I don't have any
17 recollection of discussing this letter with
18 Mr. Crowley. Much of what is in it, we
19 discussed. But, I don't think we discussed
20 it as a letter.

21 Q. Did it occur to you that Mr. Crowley
22 spent a lot of time talking about the
23 advice he got in the Goldin report, but
24 that he never mentioned Judge Walrath's

154

1 opinion and her comments about his conflict?
2 Does that strike you as odd?

3 MR. GODNICK: Objection to
4 the characterization. The question is
5 contradicted by the language of the
6 letter itself.

7 THE WITNESS: I didn't draw
8 any conclusion one way or the other from
9 the letter.

10 BY MR. LEVY:

11 Q. Did you ever have a discussion with
12 Crowley in which he talked about Goldin and
13 how Goldin's report had exonerated him?

14 A. I don't think we had a discussion.
15 I think he mentioned that.

16 Q. When he did, or at anytime did you
17 say to him what about what Judge Walrath
18 said about your conflict?

19 A. I can't remember asking him in the
20 same context that you are raising. We did
21 talk about the conflicts, as I told you at
22 the first meeting. I don't think -- he may
23 have specifically mentioned Judge Walrath.
24 I can't remember that. That is not why I

1 was there.

2 Q. He says in the second page in the
3 next-to-the-last paragraph, "However after
4 the second plan was denied, I formally
5 suspended my contractual relationship with
6 Cerberus."

7 When you met with him, or at
8 anytime between getting this letter
9 March 11 or 12 and March 25 and 26, did you
10 ask him what he meant by suspended?

11 A. I did not. By the time I was out
12 there, I asked him a question that really
13 superseded any such nomenclature. I asked
14 him if he had any relationship.

15 Q. What did he tell you?

16 A. I thought he said he had terminated
17 any and all such relationships except as to
18 the monies that they owed him, which he was
19 still claiming and then he went into the
20 discussion that from time to time they
21 asked him to evaluate members of a board of
22 directors or business opportunities and
23 that's when I got into the question which,
24 to me, was the more important issue, are

156

1 you being compensated? No. Does it have
2 anything to do with the type of business
3 that Coram is in? No. Do you do that on
4 company time? No. I don't want to repeat
5 all my testimony.

6 Q. When he told you that he was not
7 being compensated for this work, did you
8 ask him why he was doing free work for
9 Cerberus?

10 A. I didn't ask him. He told me what
11 he thought; that it was important for him
12 to continue his relationship because of the
13 large claim he had.

14 Q. His relationship with Cerberus?

15 A. Yes. I got the impression, I don't
16 know whether he said it or not, that he
17 didn't want to do anything to disturb that
18 relationship if it jeopardized this big
19 claim that he had, this money claim.

20 Q. How much was the claim?

21 A. I don't recall what it was. I know
22 it was a substantial amount of money.

23 Q. Did he say how much it was and you
24 just don't remember?

157

1 A. I can't tell you. He probably
2 mentioned some figure. I don't recall what
3 it was.

4 Q. Did you feel at that point in time,
5 March, April, did you feel that Mr. Crowley
6 was being completely open with you about
7 his relations and discussions with Cerberus?

8 A. Well, now that you have shown me
9 some of these documents, perhaps to be
10 completely open, I guess he should have
11 shown me copies of those. He did not, to
12 my recollection. I don't want to
13 characterize what he was doing. I don't do
14 that.

15 Q. Let me ask you this: If you knew,
16 had known at that time that he and his
17 lawyer were deliberately hiding from you
18 what was going on between Cerberus and
19 Crowley, would that have affected your
20 conclusion as to whether there was a
21 conflict?

22 MR. KIPNES: Objection to
23 the form of the question.

24 MR. BEATIE: It's already

158

1 been asked at least twice, anyway.

2 THE WITNESS: I will try to
3 answer it. I did not know that they
4 were hiding anything. I don't know
5 whether they were hiding. That is a
6 conclusion that somebody ought to draw.
7 I would have preferred he made
8 everything available.

9 Would that have affected me?
10 I guess anything affects a person of
11 intelligence. How much? I can't tell
12 you here without dreaming up a scenario
13 that I just didn't have.

14 Q. You can assume hypothetically, if
15 you will, that Crowley's lawyer and
16 Cerberus's lawyer deliberately planned to
17 conceal from you their negotiations and
18 their disagreements about their
19 relationship. Would that have adversely
20 affected your view of Crowley and, perhaps,
21 affected your view that there probably was
22 no conflict?

23 MR. GODNICK: Objection.

24 Objection among other grounds that that

159

1 is a offensive, offensive hypothetical
2 to me because I am Cerberus's lawyer.

3 THE WITNESS: If I confront
4 anyone who, I think, is conspiring to
5 deprive me of information, my view
6 toward that person would, obviously, be
7 affected. But it's so hypothetical, I
8 can't answer the question.

9 BY MR. LEVY:

10 Q. Let's mark this as Exhibit Number
11 16.

12 (Trustee-16, a memo from
13 Michael Cook to Scott Schreiber dated
14 April 5, 2002, marked for
15 identification.)

16 BY MR. LEVY:

17 Q. The first E-mail appears on the
18 bottom and it was sent on April 5 of 2002
19 from Scott Schreiber to Michael Cook. The
20 second, which is a response, looks like one
21 minute later from Michael Cook to Scott
22 Schreiber. Take a look at that again.

23 A. "I'd appreciate it if you would keep
24 our conversations re terminating Dan's

160

1 contract between us and our clients for
2 now. No other attorneys nor the Trustee
3 need to be part of those conversations
4 until Dan and Cerberus decide that's the
5 way to go."

6 Q. That was to Cook. And how did Cook
7 respond, looking at the top?

8 A. "No problem. Has there been a leak?
9 I know of none."

10 MR. KIPNES: I would object.

11 It misstates the record.

12 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure
13 what the question is that you want me to
14 answer.

15 Q. I assume you have never seen this?

16 A. I never saw that document nor the
17 original.

18 Q. You never saw that before?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Did you know on about April 5 that
21 Cererus and Crowley was still negotiating
22 about terminating their relationship?

23 A. I can't say I did or did not. I
24 knew that Crowley still had these claims

161

1 which he told me about and he had also told
2 me that he had been called upon from time
3 to time to give this advice to Cerberus. I
4 didn't think they had a relationship aside
5 from those two things, so I couldn't know
6 that they were trying to terminate the
7 relationship.

8 Q. Do you recognize -- do you
9 understand this exhibit to show that, first
10 of all, they had not yet terminated their
11 relationship?

12 A. That's what it seems to suggest.

13 Q. And, second of all, that they didn't
14 want you to know the status of those
15 discussions?

16 A. Well, it says "No other attorneys
17 nor the Trustee need to be part of these
18 conversations." That's from Scott to
19 Michael Cook.

20 Q. Michael answers --

21 MR. KIPNES: I think we have
22 already read it into the record.

23 THE WITNESS: It's so
24 cryptic. I'm not sure I understand what

162

1 they were driving at because he had
2 talked to me by now about what that
3 relationship was. This is April 5. I
4 don't know what they are talking about.

5 BY MR. LEVY:

6 Q. By April 5, you were under the
7 impression that the relationship had been
8 terminated?

9 A. Yes, except for these two points.

10 Q. If you had known that it hadn't been
11 terminated, that might have affected your
12 decision as to whether a conflict existed,
13 is that correct?

14 A. It could have affected it.

15 Q. Did there come a time when you
16 realized that notwithstanding what you then
17 thought about April 5 that, in fact, the
18 relationship had not yet been terminated?

19 A. I don't think so, subject to those
20 two things that we have been talking about.

21 (Trustee-17, a letter dated
22 April 10, 2002, marked for
23 identification.

24 BY MR. LEVY:

163

1 Q. This is a letter addressed to you.
2 This is signed by Dan Crowley. It bears
3 numbers Trustee 4203 through 4211 inclusive.
4 You received this letter?

5 A. Did I receive it? I'm sure I did.

6 Q. Look at the second page of the
7 letter, 4204. We have Mr. Crowley saying
8 to you, "We have some timely response
9 indicating when you wish to proceed on open
10 items. Some of them are rather urgent.
11 The items on which we need direction
12 are" -- then, if you go down to number 6,
13 "The terms for termination of the Crowley/
14 Cerberus contract." Do you see that?

15 A. I see that.

16 Q. Would you now agree with me that at
17 least as of April 10 or whenever you
18 received this letter, you knew that the
19 Crowley/Cerberus contract had not been
20 terminated?

21 MR GODNICK: Objection.

22 THE WITNESS: I thought this
23 referred to their claim, Crowley's claim
24 against Cerberus because that's what we

164

1 talked about. I still don't know that
2 that is not the case.

3 BY MR. LEVY:

4 Q. Do you know whether at that point --
5 strike that.

6 Do you have a recollection
7 now that that's what you thought?

8 A. That's my recollection, yes.

9 Q. And the next item he wants to talk
10 about is the amendment of the Crowley
11 employment contract with Coram?

12 A. Right.

13 Q. How did he then -- what amendment
14 did Crowley then indicate to you that he
15 wanted?

16 A. I don't recall right now, but I
17 think it had something to do with bonuses.
18 That's my recollection.

19 Q. Did it concern you in determining
20 whether there was a conflict? That you had
21 a situation where Crowley's claiming money
22 from Cerberus and he is doing some work
23 free for them that that might somehow bias
24 him towards acting in Cerberus's interest

165

1 so that he could solve that problem?

2 A. I was aware that was a possibility.

3 Therefore, we had to play close attention,

4 which we did.

5 Q. What did you do to -- did you ever

6 say to him, to Crowley, well, aren't you

7 conflicted by the fact that you are doing

8 this free work?

9 A. I did discuss that.

10 Q. What did he say?

11 A. He didn't think that there was any

12 conflict because that had nothing to do

13 with Coram. He was not being compensated

14 and not doing anything during his working

15 hours. Quite frankly, I think he was right

16 if those were the facts. Now, if there are

17 other facts that I don't know about, that

18 is a different story.

19 Q. You said you were concerned that

20 there be some bias towards Cerberus because

21 of what you described as a large claim and

22 the fact that he was doing free work. How

23 did he explain, if he did, how did he

24 explain that away to your satisfaction?

166

1 MR. KIPNES: Misstates the
2 record. Asked and answered. Go ahead.

3 THE WITNESS: I just don't
4 see the connection, quite frankly. I
5 don't see the conflict there.

6 He was being employed by me
7 to run this company as effectively as he
8 could. Everyone would benefit: The
9 creditors, the Noteholders, the equity
10 holders. That's what I was concerned
11 about, as I have said over and over
12 again. If I thought that the
13 performance was slipping, I would have
14 done something. I don't see how the
15 equity holders or the Noteholders would
16 be affected by a lot of the things that
17 you are asking about. Maybe I'm myopic.

18 BY MR. LEVY:

19 Q. In your mind, was the issue whether
20 what I think is a conflict was affecting
21 his work or was it whether there was a
22 conflict?

23 A. Two separate issues. Is there a
24 conflict? And if there is, is it affecting

167

1 his work? If I took his statements at face
2 value, I didn't see a conflict. If I
3 looked at his performance, I didn't see how
4 even a conflict could affect the people
5 that I was appointed to protect.

6 Q. You did take his statements at face
7 value?

8 A. I did.

9 Q. Exhibit 18 is a portion of Coram's
10 report to the Securities and Exchange
11 Commission on Form 10-K. That is the
12 annual report for the fiscal year ended
13 December 31st, 2001. It was filed on April
14 15, 2002.

15 (Trustee-18, a Form 10-K,
16 marked for identification.)

17 BY MR. LEVY:

18 Q. You were the trustee on April 15
19 when this was filed. Did you participate
20 in the preparation of the annual report on
21 Form 10-K?

22 A. I believe I did.

23 Q. And you approved it?

24 A. I think I did. I can look to see.

168

1 MR. KIPNES: You don't have
2 the entire form.

3 MR. LEVY: I don't. Do you
4 want the entire one?

5 MR. KIPNES: No. I know
6 that the period of time covered by this
7 report the witness was not the Trustee
8 or had any role whatever with Coram.

9 BY MR. LEVY:

10 Q. If you can look at the second page,
11 the last line beginning "Mr. Crowley." Did
12 you, before you approved this report, ask
13 anyone what they meant by suspended as
14 distinguished from terminated?

15 A. No, I did not.

16 MR. KIPNES: Objection to
17 the question. Assumes a fact not in
18 evidence.

19 MR. LEVY: Which one?

20 MR. KIPNES: That he
21 approved the report.

22 BY MR. LEVY:

23 Q. Did you approve the filing of this
24 report?

1 A. I don't have any recollection of
2 doing so.

3 Q. You did see this report at some
4 point? You participated in it?

5 A. I probably did. But I can't say,
6 sitting here, that I recall participating
7 in it.

8 Q. Here we are, April 15. Was it a
9 concern to you in deciding the issue of
10 whether there was a conflict that the
11 parties had not terminated or, at least,
12 they were telling the investing public they
13 had not terminated their contract, but had
14 merely suspended it in this case only
15 through April 12?

16 A. The month in question. I realize
17 or, at least, I thought what they were
18 doing is doing this on a month-to-month
19 basis because of Crowley's claims against
20 Cereberus. I may have been wrong, but that
21 was my impression.

22 Q. You didn't ask him, did you, at that
23 time?

24 A. On the date of that report, no.

170

1 Q. On or about --

2 MR. BEATIE: Objection. Why
3 are you asking that question? He said
4 that was his impression. He didn't say
5 he heard it, so you don't have to ask
6 him if he asked it.

7 BY MR. LEVY:

8 Q. On or about the date --

9 MR. BEATIE: Unless you want
10 to prolong this thing unnecessarily and
11 behave in an intentional, improper
12 conduct, as you have, in my opinion, all
13 day long and it won't happen on Friday,
14 I guarantee you.

15 MR. LEVY: I would agree
16 with you.

17 BY MR. LEVY:

18 Q. Mr. Adams, where did you get the
19 impression that they were suspending this
20 on a month-to-month basis? Where did that
21 impression come from? Did someone tell you
22 that?

23 A. I can't tell you. I don't know. I
24 had that impression that -- I guess it was

171

1 from the first meeting I had with him when
2 he said that he still had this claim. Even
3 though he had terminated all relationships,
4 he still had this claim, this substantial
5 claim against Cerberus. But, that was my
6 impression.

7 Q. Did you ever ask Crowley why he
8 thought it was an open item for you to deal
9 with the terms of the termination of his
10 contract with Cerberus?

11 A. No, I did not.

12 Q. Did you ever authorize Mr. Bressler
13 to tell Mr. Crowley something on the order
14 of you guys have smart lawyers and you
15 ought to be able to figure out how you can
16 get paid?

17 A. I can't remember any language like
18 that, no. I may have said to Mr. Bressler,
19 look, that's a matter between Crowley and
20 his former contract partner. I don't think
21 we should be using the creditors' money to
22 probe that sort of thing.

23 Q. Even though there was still some
24 reservation that might have caused some

1 bias on Crowley's part?

2 A. The amount of bias would be so
3 minimal.

4 Q. How do you know that?

5 A. It's a question of where I wanted --
6 I'm repeating now, and I am going to repeat
7 to the bankruptcy judge and to the Trustee
8 what my job was. Your question would seem
9 to indicate that my principal job was to
10 investigate the relationship between
11 Crowley and Cerberus. You may be right, I
12 did not understand that to be my job. The
13 Trustee never mentioned it to me. When I
14 was before the judge, she never mentioned
15 it to me. I was told that I was supposed
16 to maximize the assets and to minimize the
17 liabilities and get this company out of
18 bankruptcy and I was putting most of my
19 emphasis on that.

20 Today, you have gone into
21 that subject very, very little and talked
22 about this relationship and made it appear
23 that I was being negligent in not following
24 up this connection between these two

173

1 parties. And I have said to you and I will
2 say it again as clearly as I can, that if
3 that was my assignment, I'm prepared to
4 step down. I was not hired to be a
5 detective or an investigator. I don't want
6 that job. I wanted the job as a Trustee.
7 You will have to get somebody else to
8 investigate that if that's what you are
9 after.

10 MR. GODNICK: Would you mark
11 that testimony, Mr. Reporter.

12 BY MR. LEVY:

13 Q. Are you aware, Mr. Adams, that
14 sometime around the beginning of May,
15 Mr. Feinberg invited Mr. Crowley to come to
16 New York to have a dinner to talk about
17 resolving the differences?

18 A. I am not, no.

19 Q. Well, hypothetically, if during or
20 following that dinner Mr. Crowley demanded
21 that Cerberus pay him the difference
22 between some \$11,000,000.00 and the amount
23 he ultimately gets from the Coram estate,
24 would that have affected your decision as

174

1 to whether a conflict existed?

2 MR. GODNICK: Before you
3 answer, I would object. It's my
4 understanding that the question is based
5 on a document that Mr. Crowley claims to
6 be privileged. I certainly can't stop
7 you from asking the question. I think
8 this is an inappropriate line of
9 questions.

10 MR. KIPNES: It's the same
11 question.

12 THE WITNESS: That is a
13 hypothetical question. I didn't know of
14 the fact. I have not addressed the
15 fact. Asking me here for the first time
16 whether I would have considered it, I
17 can't answer that question.

18 BY MR. LEVY:

19 Q. You still don't know that that's a
20 fact?

21 A. I don't know it.

22 Q. I will show you a document marked
23 CRX 00063, 4 and 5. It was provided by
24 Coram dated May 6, 2002. It has been

175

1 redacted or, at least, there are two stamps
2 on it that indicate that portions of it
3 have been redacted, presumably, by
4 Mr. Crowley's lawyers, though I don't know.
5 I know that's the way we got it from
6 Mr. Crowley.

7 (Trustee-19, a letter dated
8 May 6, 2002, marked for identification.)

9 BY MR. LEVY:

10 Q. Take your time and read this
11 carefully.

12 MR. KIPNES: Did you say
13 this document was provided by Coram?

14 MR. LEVY: I will make the
15 correction.

16 MR. GODNICK: I have a
17 question, which is whether a motion was
18 filed? As I understand, one was going
19 to be with regard to this document.

20 MS. KRUGMAN: I don't know
21 where they came down on that. I'm
22 sitting in on this deposition. I'm the
23 wrong person, sorry.

24 MR. LEVY: I want to say

176

1 that I have here a Blackberry which gets
2 instant docket information and it
3 "ain't" been filed.

4 THE WITNESS: I have not
5 read it carefully. I have skimmed it.

6 BY MR. LEVY:

7 Q. I would ask you to, please. I would
8 ask you to read the document.

9 A. I will not read the whole thing
10 carefully. If you want me to read a
11 sentence or paragraph, fine.

12 Q. You can keep that. Have you ever
13 seen that document before this moment?

14 A. No.

15 Q. Did your counsel show it to you in
16 preparation for this deposition?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Do its contents surprise you?

19 MR. GODNICK: Objection to
20 the form of the question.

21 THE WITNESS: I don't know
22 that I'm surprised. I don't know what
23 they mean. I don't know what the
24 context is. I don't know these people.

177

1 I don't know Steve Feinberg.

2 BY MR. LEVY:

3 Q. Do you know who he is?

4 A. I have heard that he is the CEO or
5 some official of Cerberus. I don't know
6 the man. I don't know whether he is a
7 lawyer. I don't know anything about the
8 man. How could I be surprised of a copy of
9 a document not signed? The only thing that
10 concerns me in the document is the last
11 paragraph on page 1, because that refers to
12 me. "Mr. Bressler has told me that he/
13 Trustee don't want to give us/me advice
14 about ending the contract or my getting
15 paid." That's true. I wouldn't give them
16 any advice. "He also said that we have
17 smart lawyers." I don't think I ever used
18 that expression. "He's sure that they can
19 figure out how they can get me paid. He
20 has no objection to my being paid for work
21 done or for terming the contract."

22 Q. Did you authorize Bressler to say
23 that? Bressler is being quoted here, not
24 you.

178

1 A. I don't know. If he said it, he
2 said it. I don't know anything about it.

3 MR. GODNICK: I don't know
4 if the letter purports to quote Barry as
5 opposed to simply characterizing or
6 paraphrasing what the writer believes or
7 wanted to say that Barry said.

8 THE WITNESS: I may have
9 said I'm not going to get involved in
10 any contract dispute between Crowley and
11 Cerberus. That is none of my business.
12 Let them work it out. They have
13 lawyers. I may have said that. I have
14 enough to do. I'm trying to get this
15 company out of bankruptcy. That's my
16 job.

17 BY MR. LEVY:

18 Q. Might it have concerned you if, as
19 part of that contract dispute, Cerberus had
20 said we've got to meet at Coram, I will pay
21 you some more? Did that ever occur to you?

22 MR. GODNICK: Objection.

23 THE WITNESS: Did anyone say
24 anything about that? You are conjuring

179

1 up a parade of horrors. I was not
2 contemplating any such thing. I was
3 trying to concentrate on the job that I
4 assumed and I was asked to take over.

5 BY MR. LEVY:

6 Q. And not to investigate anything like
7 this?

8 MR. GODNICK: Objection to
9 the form.

10 MS. KRUGMAN: Objection.

11 MR. KIPNES: Objection.

12 MR. MILLER: Objection.

13 BY MR. LEVY:

14 Q. Sir?

15 A. I'm not going to answer that question.

16 Q. Why?

17 A. I believe I'm not answering that
18 last question.

19 Q. Tell me why, sir.

20 A. Pardon?

21 Q. Tell me why.

22 A. Because I think it's offensive.

23 Q. You said you didn't know these
24 people. These people are Feinberg, who you

1 have explained, and Dan Crowley whose name
2 appear.

3 A. I didn't refer to Dan Crowley. I
4 talked about Mr. Feinberg and talked about
5 whether he is the CEO. Never met the man.
6 I know nothing about him.

7 Q. Okay. Would you look at the
8 paragraph at the top of page, second page,
9 page 64.

10 A. The one that is partly stricken out?

11 Q. Yes. I don't know who did that.

12 A. Well, I don't know either.

13 Q. I don't either. I wasn't going to
14 ask you that.

15 A. I don't know Friedman.

16 Q. Friedman, sir, was the attorney for
17 the debtor. You must have met him at some
18 point.

19 A. I never met Mr. Friedman, to my
20 knowledge. Maybe if I saw his full name
21 on. . .

22 Q. David Friedman represented the
23 debtor up until the point when you became
24 the Trustee and no longer does. Okay?

181

1 A. I don't believe I ever met the
2 gentleman.

3 MR. MILLER: Objection.

4 That draws a conclusion that that may
5 exist.

6 MR. LEVY: I have no quarrel
7 with that. I would stipulate to it.

8 MR. MILLER: Why did you say
9 it?

10 MR. KIPNES: Is there a
11 question?

12 BY MR. LEVY:

13 Q. Here we have Mr. Crowley,
14 apparently, writing here, "I know I didn't
15 have to hire Friedman just because you
16 recommended him. I did it on my own. I
17 didn't have to recite the answers that
18 Friedman gave me to say in court."

19 Does that suggest to you,
20 based on your experience, that, perhaps, he
21 is telling Feinberg that he wasn't quite
22 telling the truth in court?

23 MR. KIPNES: Objection.

24 BY MR. LEVY:

182

1 Q. But, rather, was reciting what
2 Friedman had told him to do?

3 MR. KIPNES: Objection to
4 the form of the question. Calls for
5 speculation.

6 THE WITNESS: I don't know
7 what answers he gave. I think I just
8 would be guessing and speculating. That
9 is of no value.

10 BY MR. LEVY:

11 Q. Given your experience, sir, your
12 impression of that sentence, what does it
13 mean to you? What is your understanding of
14 it, knowing no more than what is on this
15 paper?

16 MR. KIPNES: Wait a minute.
17 You are asking him just to read this
18 sentence totally out of context by
19 itself and give you his impression of
20 what the author of that sentence meant?

21 MR. LEVY: I reject your
22 characterization of my question. I take
23 it, it's an objection to the form?

24 THE WITNESS: I can't answer

183

1 that question. I don't know what they
2 were talking about. I don't know the
3 people. I don't know what the context
4 is.

5 BY MR. LEVY:

6 Q. Who are the people? You know one of
7 the people, like the guy who wrote it,
8 Mr. Crowley.

9 A. I'm not sure. It's not signed.

10 Q. Do you doubt that Crowley wrote it?

11 A. I don't know. I have no -- you put
12 a document in front of me. I have never
13 seen it before. It's marked "Draft,
14 Redacted." It's written to somebody that I
15 have never met, don't know, and it has
16 various places redacted or stricken and you
17 are asking me what is my opinion about a
18 couple of sentences. I can't do it. I
19 don't have that ability.

20 Q. Is it significant to you that it
21 came from Mr. Crowley's file?.

22 MR. GODNICK: Significant in
23 what respect?

24 THE WITNESS: Of some

1 significance is the fact that it came
2 out of Mr. Crowley's file.

3 BY MR. LEVY:

4 Q. Doesn't that suggest to you that,
5 perhaps, he wrote it?

6 A. I don't know.

7 Q. What significance does it have?

8 A. Just what you said. It came out of
9 his files. It seems to me he is talking to
10 him about the same thing he talked to me
11 about, assuming that it's Crowley; that he
12 was trying to get Cerberus to pay him what
13 he thought Cerberus owed him for past
14 service, which he told me about.

15 Q. Look at the next page, if you would.

16 A. "I expect that you will honor the
17 commitment."

18 Q. Read it to yourself.

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Assuming that Mr. Crowley wrote
21 that --

22 MR. KIPNES: That's a very
23 large assumption. Go ahead.

24 MR. LEVY: Why did you have